

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-20 and rejected claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-20. With this paper, various of the claims are amended, none are canceled, and no new claims are added, so that claims 1-20 remain in the application.

Objections to the claims

At sections 1 and 2 of the Office action, claims 3 and 5 are objected to for informalities. With this paper, claims 3 and 5 are changed in a way believed to obviate the grounds for the objections.

Rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

At section 4 of the Office action, claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, because of a missing antecedent in claim 3. With this paper, claim 3 is changed in a way believed to obviate the grounds for the rejection. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At section 7 of the Office action, claims 1, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Application Publication 2002/0159410 to Odenwalder et al.

With this paper, various of the claims are amended to more distinctly claim the invention and to correct obvious errors. In particular, claim 1 is amended to clarify that the signals being transmitted and received are feedback signals, sent in response to a packet previously sent by what is now referred to as the feedback-signal-receiving entity and received by what is now

called the feedback-signal-transmitting entity. The feedback-signal-transmitting entity is often referred to in the disclosure as a data-receiving entity, since it receives data (packets) from a data-transmitting entity, and provides feedback signalling in response. Claim 1 thus now more clearly recites a step in which in order to indicate whether a payload message--sent in response to a packet previously transmitted by the feedback-signal-receiving entity and conveying feedback indicating whether the packet was successfully received--is being or was transmitted in a predefined positive or negative offset of one or more time intervals from a current time interval, the feedback-signal-transmitting entity additionally signals in the current time interval an indication symbol providing preamble or postamble signalling.

In contrast, Odenwalder teaches (in particular at paragraph 29) the use of a preamble symbol--on a special preamble channel--to forewarn a receiving entity that it is about to receive a "subpacket," i.e. a unit of data, as opposed to feedback (see paragraph 24, explaining that "subpacket" is just a term for a data traffic payload, and is intended to be sent possibly several times and soft-combined at the receiver). Thus, Odenwalder does not teach signalling in respect to a payload message conveying feedback information, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 of claim 1, and also of claims 8 and 15 since they each depend from claim 1,, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's

attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

Oct. 4, 2004
Date
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224